

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
COLUMBIA DIVISION

|                                  |   |                                   |
|----------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|
| Dexter Lamont Crawford, #231730, | ) |                                   |
|                                  | ) |                                   |
| Petitioner,                      | ) | Civil Action No.: 3:12-cv-661-TLW |
| v.                               | ) |                                   |
|                                  | ) |                                   |
| Willie Eagleton, Warden,         | ) |                                   |
|                                  | ) |                                   |
| Respondent.                      | ) |                                   |
| _____                            | ) |                                   |

**ORDER**

Petitioner, Dexter Lamont Crawford (“petitioner”), filed this pro se petition for a writ of habeas corpus seeking relief pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254 on March 1, 2012. (Doc. #1). Respondent filed a return and motion for summary judgment on August 1, 2012. (Doc. #18; 19). Petitioner filed a response opposing Respondent’s motion on October 12, 2012. (Doc. #27).

This matter now comes before this Court for review of the Report and Recommendations (“the Report”) issued on January 24, 2013 by United States Magistrate Judge Joseph R. McCrorey, to whom this case had previously been assigned. (Doc. #29). In the Report, the Magistrate Judge recommends that the District Court grant Respondent’s motion for summary judgment and dismiss the § 2254 petition without an evidentiary hearing. (Doc. #29). The petitioner did not file objections to the Magistrate Judge’s Report. The deadline to file objections lapsed on February 11, 2013.

This Court is charged with conducting a de novo review of any portion of the Magistrate Judge’s Report to which a specific objection is registered, and may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendations contained in that report. 28 U.S.C. § 636. In the absence

of objections to the Report of the Magistrate Judge, this Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. See Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983).

This Court has carefully reviewed the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation and the record in this case. The petitioner did not file objections to the Report. Accordingly, for the reasons articulated by the Magistrate Judge, it is hereby **ORDERED** that the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation is **ACCEPTED**. (Doc. #29). The Respondent's motion for summary judgment (Doc. #18) is hereby **GRANTED**. The above-captioned matter is hereby dismissed with prejudice and without an evidentiary hearing.

The Court has reviewed the petition in accordance with Rule 11 of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Proceedings. The Court concludes that it is not appropriate to issue a Certificate of Appealability as to the issues raised herein. Petitioner is advised that he may seek a Certificate from the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals under Rule 22 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/ Terry L. Wooten  
Terry L. Wooten  
Chief United States District Judge

February 28, 2013  
Columbia, South Carolina